

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 15, 16 and 20-34 are pending. Initially, Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the objections to the drawings and specification, as well as for the rejections over GB 2096665A and WoodFloorsOnline.com.

New claims 25-34 are supported by the originally filed specification, e.g., at the third full paragraph of page 3, the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6, and Figs. 1-4. No new matter has been entered. These claims further distinguish over the cited art.

I. GB '457 in view of Kornfalt et al.

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10, 12 and 14-24 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over GB2141457A in view of Kornfalt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,517,935). The Office Action asserts GB '457 teaches each feature of the claims, except for decorating only one face of the molding, for which purpose Kornfalt et al. is apparently cited. Because Kornfalt et al. shows a molding having laminate on one side, the Office Action asserts it would have been obvious to provide the *reversible molding* 12 of GB '457 with a laminate on one side. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Initially, Applicant respectfully submits that the structure identified by reference number 12 in GB '457 is identified and described as a "strip," i.e., not a reversible molding as presently claimed, and strip 12 is not described as being reversible, i.e., so that either side can be used as the outward face. In fact, nowhere in the text of GB '457 is strip 12 described as being provided with any decorative face as presently claimed. As a result, there is no description of any additional decorative faces allowing for the strip 12 to be used in a reverse configuration. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that strip 12 is not a "reversible molding" as claimed.

Thus, the strip 12 of GB '457 cannot have multiple decorative faces made from foil, laminate, veneer, paint, stain, and clear protective material as claimed.

Moreover, although Kornfalt et al. explains how to form a molding having been made from a fiberboard core and a laminate thereon, the combination of references fails to disclose

each and every feature of the claims, and there cannot be any motivation to do what the present inventor has done, i.e., produce a single molding product which can be used in multiple designs. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits, it cannot be considered obvious to achieve a product having properties not known in the art. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

a. Claims 1 and 14

Claims 1 and 14 recite that each of the faces of the reversible molding are made from foil, laminate veneer, paint, stain or a clear protective coating (both claims 1 and 14) and have the same shape (claim 1 only). Even if the strip 12 of the primary reference were considered to be a reversible molding (a conclusion with which Applicant disagrees - see above), the combination of GB '457 and Kornfalt et al. would not motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to do what the present inventor has done, i.e., produce a single molding which can have multiple, yet different, designs.

b. Claim 3

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and recites that each of the molding faces include a curved surface. As the strip 12 of GB '457 appears to be a rectangular solid, it cannot have any curved surfaces.

c. Claim 7

Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and recites the faces are in the shape of a wall base molding. Although wall base moldings are generally known in the art, the Office Action fails to show any reversible moldings including at least two wall base molding faces of the same shape.

d. Claim 8

Claim 8 depends from claim 1 and recites the faces are in the shape of a base shoe. Although base shoe moldings are generally known in the art, the Office Action fails to show any reversible moldings having multiple faces forming base shoe moldings of the same shape.

e. Claims 16 and 21

Claims 16 and 21 depend from claim 14 and recites that at least one (claim 16) or all (claim 21) of the faces include a foil. While Applicant agrees that foils are generally known, the Office Action fails to explain why one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to substitute the abrasion resistant laminate of Kornfalt et al. with a foil. The Office Action additionally fails to show any product having foil on multiple faces, wherein the foil differs in texture, design, pattern, color or shape.

f. Claim 20

Claim 20 recites a method of reducing molding inventories. Specifically, the molding is offered in one step and sold in a different step. As none of the cited references relate to molding inventories or selling of moldings, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

g. Claim 22

Claim 22 depends from claim 14 and recites that the molding has a wall base molding-shaped face. The Office Action fails to show all the features of or explain why one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to form a reversible molding having such features.

h. Claims 23 and 24

Claims 23 and 24 depend from claims 20 and 14, respectively, and recite that a face of the reversible molding is either a quarter round or a base shoe molding. The Office Action fails to show all the feature of or explain why one of ordinary skill in the art would have wanted to form a reversible molding having one base shoe or quarter round molding face, and a second face which differs in texture, design, pattern, color or shape.

II. Hovde in view of Kornfalt et al.

Claims 1, 11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hovde (U.S. Patent No. 4,557,096) in view of Kornfalt et al. The Office Action asserts Hovde teaches each feature of the claims except for decorative faces on a molding which faces differ by texture, design, pattern or color, for which purpose Kornfalt et al. is cited.

Again, Applicant respectfully submits that the structure identified by reference number 26 in Hovde is a “lining strip,” i.e., and is not described as being a reversible molding. While other structures described therein may be moldings, lining strip 26, being a rectangular solid, is not. Moreover, lining strip 26 is not described as being reversible, i.e., so that either side can be used as the outward face. There is no description of multiple decorative faces allowing for the lining strip 26 to be used in a reverse configuration. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the lining strip 26 of the cited reference cannot be a “reversible molding” as claimed.

Accordingly, even if the lining strip of Hovde were treated as described by Kornfalt et al., a reversible molding having multiple decorative faces having the same shape and are made from foil, laminate, veneer, paint, stain, or clear protective material, wherein at least two of the faces are of different texture, design, pattern, as recited by claim 1 (and claims 11 and 13 depending therefrom).

III. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections and passage of the application to issue. If any fee is necessary to make this paper timely and/or complete, such fee may be deducted from deposit account no. 19-4375.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas P. Pavelko
Registration No. 31,689

TPP/EPR/mat
Attorney Docket No.: TPP 31700
STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850
Washington, D.C. 20036

Telephone: (202) 785-0100
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200 or (202) 408-5088

Date: June 6, 2007